

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 remain pending in this application for which applicants seek reconsideration.

IDS

The examiner crossed out the Search Report (from the corresponding PCT application) cited in the PTO-1449. Applicants seek clarification regarding why the examiner did not consider the Search Report document in itself.

Amendment

Claims 1 and 5 have been amended. Claim 1 has been amended to improve its form and clarity, as well as to more clearly define how the feeding mechanism feeds the plurality of continuous sequin strips. Allowable claim 5 has been placed in independent form, while incorporating the improved form of claim 1. No new matter has been introduced.

Allowable Claims

Claims 5 and 6 were indicated to be allowable if they are placed in independent form. As claim 5 has been placed in independent form, these claims are in condition for allowance.

Art Rejection

Claims 1 and 8-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Fink (USP 1,107,599), and claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Fink. Moreover, claims 2-4 and 11 were rejected under § 103(a) as unpatentable over Fink in view of Nassberg (USP 797,308).

Independent claim 1 now defines that the sequins of each of the continuous sequin strips have holes, and that positions of the holes of the sequins are aligned in the overlapped state to permit the feeding mechanism to engage the holes of the aligned sequins to sequentially feed the plurality of continuous sequin strips at the predetermined pitch at a time in interlocked relation to predetermined sewing operation.

Applicants submit that none of the applied references would have disclosed or taught sequentially indexing and feeding multiple strips of sequins that are in the overlapped state as set forth in claim 1. Although Nassberg appears to disclose indexing and feeding a strip of

sequins while engaging the holes in the sequins, applicants submit that it would not have taught feeding multiple strips of overlapping sequins.

Conclusion

Applicants submit that claims 1-11 patentably distinguish over the applied references and are in condition for allowance. Should the examiner have any issues concerning this reply or any other outstanding issues remaining in this application, applicants urge the examiner to contact the undersigned to expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

ROSSI, KIMMS & McDOWELL LLP

12 JUNE 2007

DATE

/Lyle Kimms/

LYLE KIMMS

REG. NO. 34,079 (RULE 34, WHERE APPLICABLE)

P.O. BOX 826

ASHBURN, VA 20146-0826

703-726-6020 (PHONE)

703-726-6024 (FAX)